

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/611,367	WHITE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Patricia L Engle	3612	

All Participants:

(1) Patricia L Engle.

(2) Kathryn Marra.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 17 September 2004

Time: 4 pm

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
☐ Video Conference
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No
 If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1 and 2

Prior art documents discussed:

Bailey

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will ~~provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.~~ **provided a written summary in Part II above**
☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)



(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner suggested incorporating claim 2 into claim 1 to put the case in condition for allowance. Examiner stated that she would maintain the Bailey rejection of claim 1, because the term "unitary" only requires that the outer panel be a unit (which could be made of several parts). Claim 1 was added to claim 2 so that the claims depending from claim 2 would not have to be amended. Kathy Marra requested that the term "unitary inner panel" be changed to --inner panel--. The Examiner agreed..